

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Amended Claims

Independent claim 76 has been amended to incorporate the elements of claims 77 and 78. Claims 77-78 have been canceled. Claim 87 has been amended to clarify the recited subject matter.

Paragraph 1 of Office Action

No response required.

Paragraph 2 of Office Action

No response required.

Paragraph 3 of Office Action

Claim 87 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claim 87 to clarify that the sensor activates or deactivates the control circuitry of the device. Support for this claim element is found in the specification on page 61, lines 4-17. Claim 87 should now satisfy the second paragraph of section 112.

Paragraph 4 of Office Action

Claims 76-77 and 87-88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either Twigg (US 5524489) or Okada (US 5406848). Applicants respectfully traverse. Claim 76 has been amended to incorporate the elements of claim 78, which was indicated as being patentably distinguishable over the art of record. Thus, this rejection may now be withdrawn.

Paragraph 5 of Office Action

Claims 82 and 84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Twigg. This rejection may now be withdrawn in view of the amendment to claim 76, from which claims 82 and 84 depend.

Paragraph 6 of Office Action

Claim 85 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Twigg. This rejection may now be withdrawn in view of the amendment to claim 76, from which claim 85 depends.

Paragraph 7 of Office Action

Claim 79 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Twigg or Okada, further in view of Saab (US 5736923). This rejection may now be withdrawn in view of the amendment to claim 76, from which claim 79 depends.

Paragraph 8 of Office Action

Claim 80 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Twigg or Okada, further in view of Dutta (US 2003/76408). This rejection may now be withdrawn in view of the amendment to claim 76, from which claim 80 depends.

Paragraph 9 of Office Action

Claim 81 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Twigg or Okada, further in view of Campman (US 5317305) or Cameron et al. (US 5811910). This rejection may now be withdrawn in view of the amendment to claim 76, from which claim 81 depends.

Paragraph 10 of Office Action

Claims 89-90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Twigg or Okada, further in view of Lemelson (US 4337462). This rejection may now be withdrawn in view of the amendment to claim 76, from which claims 89-90 depend.

Paragraph 11 of Office Action

Claims 76-77 and 81-89 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 6-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,940,405 in view of either Twigg or Okada. This rejection may now be withdrawn in view

of the amendment to claim 76, from which claims 81-89 depend. Claim 77 has been canceled

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the application as presently amended meets all of the requirements for patentability. Notices of Allowability and Allowance are therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Walter W. Duft/

Walter W. Duft
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,948

Law Offices of Walter W. Duft
8616 Main Street, Suite 2
Williamsville, New York 14221
Telephone: (716) 633-1930
Facsimile: (716) 633-1932